## Casca3e04:04-0460346-52-SIDobourou emetri2:32132 FFilead 10011/0091/20007PagRagieo fi 4of 4 1 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. Eduardo G. Roy (State Bar # 146316) Rodney R. Patula (State Bar # 182052) 2 Evan S. Nadel (State Bar # 213230) 3 Daniel T. Balmat (State Bar # 230504) One Maritime Plaza, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111 3492 4 Telephone: +1.415.954.0200 5 Facsimile: +1.415.393.9887 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 MCINERNEY & DILLON, P.C. Timothy L. McInerney (State Bar # 124807) 8 LeCarie S. Whitfield (State Bar # 192186) Gregory J. Gangitano (State Bar # 226987) 9 1999 Harrison Street, Ste. 1700 Oakland, CA 94612-4700 10 Telephone: +1.510.465.7100 Facsimile: +1.510.465.855611 William J. McGahan (State Bar # 165706) 12 General Counsel F.W. SPENCER & SON. INC. 13 1422 Harrison Street Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: +1.510.451.2300 14 Facsimile: +1.510.238.105915 Attorneys for Defendants 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 18 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID Case No. C 04 4632 SI 19 **TRANSIT DISTRICT**, a multi-county rapid transit district established and 20 existing under the laws of California; 21 Plaintiff. **JOINT APPLICATION FOR 48-HOUR** ENLARGEMENT OF TIME FOR PRE-22 TRIAL FILINGS VS. 23 WILLIAM D. SPENCER, an individual; **Trial Date:** January 22, 2007

24

25

26

27

28

F.W. SPENCER & SON, INC., a

California corporation; **BRISBANE MECHANICAL CO.**, a California

individual; BRUCE R. BONAR, an

individual; and DOES 1-25,

corporation; WILLIAM MCGAHAN, an

Defendants.

## Cascase08:04-0460346532-SIDobournemetr232132 FFileed10011/0191/20007PagReage024of 4

	l ·
1	In light of the Court's Order, served by the Electronic Case Facility at 3:39 p.m. today,
2	denying plaintiff's motion for reconsideration concerning summary judgment on plaintiff's unjust
3	enrichment claim, the parties hereby jointly request an extension of time of 48 hours to file the
4	joint pre-trial conference statement and other pre-trial filings specified in the Court's prior case
5	management order.
6	Because the Court had ordered defendants to file their opposition to the motion for
7	reconsideration by January 10, plaintiff did not anticipate that the Court would decide the motion
8	today. Consequently, plaintiff drafted its portions of the joint pre-trial conference statement with
9	the assumption that the motion for reconsideration still would be pending at the time of filing and,
10	thus, the pending motion and potential for reinstatement of the unjust enrichment claim
11	profoundly affected the content of the pre-trial submissions. In addition, during the parties' meet
12	and confer conferences on pre-trial submissions, they conferred under impression that this motion
13	was still pending and would not be decided at the time of filing those submissions. The parties
14	both agree that an extension of time of 48 hours to file the pre-trial submissions would be helpful
15	as a result of this development.
16	
17	DATED: January 9, 2007 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
18	Dru /s/Evon C. Nodol
19	By: <u>/s/Evan S. Nadel</u> Eduardo G. Roy Rodney R. Patula
20	Evan S. Nadel Daniel T. Balmat
21	Attorneys for Plaintiff
22	DATED: January 9, 2007 MCINERNEY & DILLON, P.C.
23	DATED. January 9, 2007 WICHVERIVET & DILLON, 1.C.
24	By: /s/Timothy L. McInerney Timothy L. McInerney
25	LeCarie S. Whitfield Gregory J. Gangitano
26	Attorneys for Defendants
27	(Continued on Next Page)
28 Ers &	
L.P.	-1-

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
One Maritime Plaza, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111-3492

	Caseases-04-04-04-052-51Decurrentiazo2 miestroutros/2007Pagreages-414
1	(Continued From Previous Page)
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.
3	11 IS SO ORDERED.
4	
5	DATED: HON SUSANILL STON
6	HON. SUSAN ILLSTON
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	
28	
20 RS &	-2-

JOINT APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, Case No. C 04 4632 SI

San Francisco, CA 94111-3492

Casase 3:04-04-04-026 \$2-SID obcome netro 2:2132 File at 1001/019/2000 7 Page 4:04 4:0f 4